

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE In re Patent Application of:

Inventor:

OKA, et al

Group Art Unit:

1756

Application No.:

08/602,622

Conf. No.:

. 2391

Examiner:

Thorl Chea

Filed:

June 25, 2003

Title:

PHOTOTHERMOGRAPHIC MATERIAL

DECLARATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. \$1.132

Commissioner for Patents

(P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450)

Sir:

I, Seiichi Yamamoto, do declare and state as follows:

I graduated from Tohoku University with a Master's Degree in Chemistry in March 1990;

I joined Fuji Photo Film Co., Ltd. in April 1990, and since that time I have been engaged in research and development in the field of silver halide photosensitive materials for printing, and since March 2000, in the field of silver halide photosensitive materials for medical use at

Ashigara Laboratory;

I am a co-inventor of the subject matter disclosed and claimed in the above-identified application; and

I am familiar with the Office Action of September 24, 2004, and understand that the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Ito (US Patent No. 6,376,167) and Ikari (US Patent No. 6,482,583) and Claims 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito (US Patent No. 6,376,167).

The following additional comparative experiments were carried out by me or under my supervision in order to make the advantages of the subject matter clearer.

Experiment A

Samples A, B, C and D were prepared in the same manner as Sample 13 of Example 1 described in Applicants' Specification except that the polyhalogen compounds of Samples A, B, C and D were replaced with the polyhalogen compounds (1)-34, (1)-35, (3)-34 and (3)-35 of Ito(US Patent No. 6,376,167), respectively.

Samples 13 and A, B, C and D were processed and evaluated in the same manner as in Example 1 described in Applicants' Specification.

The results obtained are listed in following Table 1.

TABLE 1

TABLE 1						
Sample	Poly-	Sensit	ΔFog	Printout	Remarks	
No.	halogen	ivity	<u> </u>	performance		
	cmpd.					
13	1 & 2	104	0.01	0.01	Present	
					Invention	
A	(1)-34	110	0.05	0.06	Comparative	
	(from				Example	
	Ito)					
В	(1)-35	111	0.05	0.07	Comparative	
	(from				Example	
<u> </u>	Ito)			·		
C	(3) -34	109	0.05	0.06	Comparative	
	(from				Example	
	Ito)					
D	(3) -35.	108	0.05	0.06	Comparative	
	(from				Example	
	Ito)					

As seen in Table 1 above, inclusion of the polyhalogen

compounds of the present invention (Sample 13) were unexpectedly superior in sensitivity, printout performance and fogging during storage when compared to the use of the polyhalogen compounds of Ito.

Experiment B

Sample 8a, 8b, 8c, 9a, 9b, 9c, 10-1, 10-2, 10-3, 10-4 and 10-5 were prepared in the same manner as in Example 4 described in Applicants' Specification, except that the doped metals in the photosensitive halide emulsion were changed to those as shown in Table 2 below.

Samples 8a, 8b, 8c, 9a, 9b, 9c, 10-1, 10-2, 10-3, 10-4 and 10-5 were processed and evaluated in the same manner as in Example 4 described in Applicants' Specification.

The results obtained are listed in following currently amended Table 2.

TABLE 2

			T			
Sample	First	Second	Dmin	Sensit	Printout	Remarks
No.	Metal	Metal		ivity	performance	
3a	Ir	-	0.17	100	0.11	Comparative
						Example
3b	-	Fe	0.17	103	0.10	Comparative

				• •		
						Example
3′	Ir	Fe	0.16	107	0.07	Present
ļ		<u> </u>				Invention
10-1	Ir	Au	0.18	110	0.12	Comparative
				_		Example
5a	Cu	-	0.17	101	0.10	Comparative
						Example
5b	-	Fe	0.17	102	0.10	Comparative
					·	Example
5′	Cu	Fe	0.16	105	0.07	Present
						Invention
10-2	Cu	Au	0.18	109	0.11	Comparative
						Example
6a	Fe	-	0.17	101	0.10	Comparative
						Example
6b	-	Pt	0.17	102	0.10	Comparative
					·	Example
6′	Fe	Pt	0.16	106	0.08	Present
						Invention
7a	Os	-	0.17	100	0.10	Comparative
						Example
7b	-	Fe	0.17	103	0.10	Comparative
						Example
7′	Os	Fe	0.16	106	0.07	Present
						Invention

10-3	Os	Au	0.18	110	0.11	Comparative
		<u> </u>				Example
8a	Ru	-	0.17	104	0.11	Comparative
						Example
8b	-	Fe	0.17	103	0.10	Comparative
	_					Example
8C	Ru	Fe	0.17	106	0.07	Present
		<u> </u>				Invention
9a	_	_	0.18	98	0.12	Comparative
						Example
9b	-	Cu	0.17	101	0.11	Comparative
						Example
9c	Ru	Cu	0.05	104	0.06	Present
	<u> </u>					Invention
10-4	-	Au	0.19	109	0.12	Comparative
	<u> </u>					Example
10-5	Fe	Au	0.19	109	0.11	Comparative
						Example

Note: For "Au", Potassium chloroaurate, which is typical as an Au-sensitizer, was used, and substituted at an amount of equimolar of Fe compound.

As shown in Table 2, the samples employing the present invention exhibited unexpected superiority in comparison to Samples 10-2, 10-3, 10-4 and 10-5, in which Au and another

22/ 22 # **8/** 8

metal was simultaneously doped.

Conclusions

The present invention showed unexpectedly greater improvements in sensitivity, printout performance and fogging during storage than the comparative examples.

I further declare that all statements made herein of my own knowledge are true and that all statements made on information and belief are believed to be true, and further, that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and like so made are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code and that such willful false statements may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issued thereon.

DATE:

January 19. 2005

Seilchi Yamamoto

SEIICHI YAMAMOTO